In the Honble High Court of Chhattishgarh at Bilaspur (.C. G.)

W.P..No, No.....38..... 2006

Single Bench

P.R. No. 6574/25
Presented by Shri Somnath Verma
dated 24/12/25

Petitioner ..... Saroj Prasad aged 61 years son of late Shri Ram Keshar Singh, Head Master, Middle School Village Golkumhada, Block Charama District Kanker (C.G.)

VERSUS

Respondent ..... 1. State of Chhattisgarh
Through the Secretary,
Tribal Welfare Department Ministry,
D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. Assistant Commissioner,
Tribal Welfare Department, (Madhya Bastar),
Jagdalpur (C.G.)

3. Principal,
T.W.D., Govt. Model Higher Secondary School, Pharasgaon, Block Kontagaon, District Bastar, Jagdalpur (C.G.)

4. Assistant Commissioner,
Tribal Welfare Department, Kanker (C.G.)

5. Block Education Officer, Tribal Welfare Deptt., Charama District Kankker.

RECEIVED COPY
22.12.05
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

Writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus certiorari, prohibition and for other suitable writ/writs, order/orders, and direction/directions.

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

WP 38/06

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

..... विरुद्ध .....

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	5-1-2006 Shri R.S. Shrivastava, counsel for the petitioner. Shri S.S. Rajput, Panel Lawyer for the State. Heard. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the matter relates to grant of increment to the petitioner. It is pointed out that the petitioner has not submitted any representation to the State of Chhattisgarh. It is also pointed out that the petitioner has submitted his last representation before the authorities on 18-3-1998 (Annexure-P/4) i.e. before reorganization, which is highly belated and the petition deserves to be dismissed. It is also noted that the State of Madhya Pradesh has not joined as party/respondent in the instant petition. At this stage, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that he may be permitted to make representation to the authorities concerned. Not opposed. Since counsel for the petitioner himself wants to submit representation, he may submit the same before the competent authorities and on such representation being filed by the petitioner, the competent authorities may decide the representation on its own merits in accordance with law. With the aforesaid observations, this petition stands disposed of. Certified copy as per rules. Sd/- Fakhruddin Judge	
Gowri		

[पीछे देखिये

12.1.06 23/1/06